

**MINUTES**  
**Nevada State Council on Libraries and Literacy**  
**January 25-26, 2017**  
**Western Nevada College, Cedar Building, room 307**

**Wednesday, January 25, 2017**

**1. Call to order, announcements, and roll call**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 am. Dee Dee Bossart is acting as chairperson on behalf of Jeanette Hammons.

Members present: Ananda Campbell, Sheila Moulton, Robert Jones, Betts Markle, Jeanne Price, Chris Etchegoyhen, Nancy Schmidt, Connie Lucido, Karsten Heise, Kim Petersen

Excused: Jeanette Hammons, Ian Salzman, Kathleen Galland-Collins, Renee Olsen, Margot Chappel

Secretary of Council: Jeffrey Kintop

Nevada State Library, Archives and Public Records Staff: Tammy Westergard, Sulin Jones

**2. Public comment**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

No public comment

**3. Consent Agenda**

- Approval of Minutes, October 17, 2016.

**Motion:** Betts Markle moved to approve, Jeanne Price seconded the motion. Both Karsten Heise and Dee Dee Bossart abstained from voting. Motion was passed.

- Approval of 2017 Mini Grant applications. Sulin Jones presented an overview of the LSTA mini grant projects. Nancy Schmidt commented that she was impressed by both UNR's *Improving Rural Patron Access to Consumer Health Information* and Henderson's *Capturing Henderson's History: One Scan at a Time*. She would like them to be monitored as they might have potential to be expanded. Jeannie Price asked if mini grants were always \$5,000. Ms. Jones replied that mini grants must be \$5,000 or less. **Motion:** Connie Lucido moved to accept the presented 2017 mini grant applications, Ms. Price seconded. Motion approved

- Approval of 2017 Statewide Projects. Ms. Jones and Tammy Westergard presented a brief overview of the statewide and support grants with more information on additional support projects to be forthcoming during the next meeting. **Motion:** Chris Etchegoyhen moved to accept the Statewide projects presented, Betts Markle seconded. Motion approved.

**4. Officer Elections**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

- Ms. Markle nominated Nancy Schmidt as vice-chairperson and Ms. Bossart, currently Vice Chair, nominated herself to the role of chairperson. Karsten Heise nominated to accept Dee Dee Bossart as Chair and Nancy Schmidt as Vice Chair. Council approved unanimously.

**5. Biennial Report to the Governor**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

- The 2017 governor's report has been written by Jeanette Hammons, but has not yet been formatted or submitted. Item was tabled for later discussion.

**6. Nevada Legislative Day and National Library Legislative Day**

**Jeffrey Kintop**

- May 1-2, 2017 has been set aside for National Library Legislative Day. The Spring SCLL meeting will coincide with Nevada's Library Legislative Day on April 12, 2017. The Nevada Library Association (NLA) will not hire a lobbyist, but instead will focus on grassroots activism and

strengthening relationships with new and returning legislators. Sheila Moulton emphasized the impact of reaching out to one's local legislative representatives as a means to increasing libraries' visibility.

#### **7. Report: Nevada State Library, Archives and Public Records**

**Jeffrey Kintop**

- Legislative Session update. Jeffrey Kintop presented an overview of budgetary and funding issues facing NSLAPR. Mr. Kintop discussed the possibility of a 5% budget cut to NSLAPR, to be ameliorated by consolidating operations, reducing collections expenditures and the subscription to World Book encyclopedia database. Also discussed was the goal of expanding the library's digital resource and cultivating the collection while phasing out the acquisition of physical books and publications.
- Council Appointments. Ms. Westergard informed Council that 5 of the 6 vacancies have been filled. A representative of private sector employers is still needed.
- NSLAPR Staff Update. Ms. Westergard discussed the importance of the library consultant position and the upcoming hire of an Administrative Assistant, Library Assistant III, and Librarian II.

#### **8. Council Member Introductions**

**Tammy Westergard**

- Ananda Campbell-Richards, Library Media Coordinator for Carson City School District, representing Labor Organizations; Jeanne Frazier Price, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, William Boyd School of Law, UNLV, representing Special Libraries; Nancy Schmidt, Northern Nevada Literacy Council, representing Literacy Organizations; Ian Salzman, 2015 Teacher of the Year, Spring Valley High School, representing Classroom Reading Teachers; Karsten Heise, Director of Technology Commercialization, ex-officio designee for the Governor's Office of Economic Development; and Connie Lucido, grants specialists, ex-officio designee for the Nevada Department of Administration, are the newest members of the State Council on Libraries and Literacy.

#### **9. Proxy Voting**

**Tammy Westergard**

- Proxy Voting had been brought up for consideration in October, with need for further discussion agreed upon. Ms. Price asked for clarification as to what proxy voting entailed, which was provided by a discussion among members. Ms. Price also noted that bylaws usually detail how members may vote. Ms. Lucido then asked whether we needed to change bylaws to allow proxy voting, to which Mr. Kintop added that for auditing purposes, if Council would like to allow proxy voting it's best to change the bylaws, as it becomes a more permanent part of the record. Discussion was tabled until the next meeting at which Ms. Jones will present possible bylaw amendment language.

#### **Open Discussion**

There was a discussion as to whether or not to move agenda items up as the meeting was not taking as long as anticipated. Ms. Lucido pointed out any acceleration of the agenda might violate open public meeting rules. Council and NSLAPR staff agreed to use the available time before agenda item 11 to have an open discussion period about technical aspects of the LSTA application review process. Questions:

- Please explain the Indirect Cost rate: how do libraries determine whether to request this and how is it calculated? Mr. Kintop explained that with Indirect Costs, grant money is used to meet overhead expenses and administrative costs of running grant projects, lowering the actual amount that is available to spend on the project. Universities usually ask for Indirect Costs, and must submit their federally negotiated indirect costs rate backup documentation. Smaller libraries typically do not request Indirect Costs, instead using their overhead outlays to meet

Match requirements. Libraries without a federally approved rate may use the 10% rate, but after that, usually must submit an application to the federal government to obtain one. IMLS guidance will note whether it's a one-time only option.

- What is the difference between salary match and salary in-kind? Ms. Westergard said that salary match entails an actual cash matching scheme, with added staff hours, whereas in-kind entails matching from existing line items in the local operating budget.
- What are the rules regarding the use of grant money on for-profit companies. Mr. Kintop replied that there was no conflict to using money to buy outside supplies, hire consultants, etc. so long as it's in line with grant aims. A debate about the efficacy of consultants ensued, with both pros and cons of said consultants argued.
- How much funding has been requested by the mini and competitive applicants? Ms. Jones answered that funding requests, after Statewide programs are funded, exceed the amount left available by about \$200,000. A statement was made that nearly all requests for grants get funded. Ms. Schmidt added that the renegotiation of grants fund requests can and has been done in order to have projects receive funding.
- A question was raised as to why so few grant applicants put forth projects involving collaboration, to which Ms. Westergard replied that it depended on the nature of the grant. No rules required collaboration. Ms. Schmidt added that some applications note that projects will continue beyond the grant period through partnerships.

#### **Lunch break**

#### **10. LSTA 2017 Competitive Grant Application Review (discussion/for possible action begins at 1:00 pm)**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

Meeting called back to order at 1:00 pm.

- **Carson City Public Library, *Makelt@Two: The Maker Movement at the Carson City Library.***  
Natalie Wood and Sena Lloyd.
  - Mr. Heise asked why the library did not include teens and young adults in their MakerSpace proposal to which Ms. Wood and Ms. Loyd replied that as there were already similar library resources available to children and teens, they were not the primary target audience of this project. Mr. Heise also asked if partnerships were being forged in the local community (affirmative), the budget and sustainability, and whether equipment donations were being sought. Ms. Wood said donations sources were being pursued. The types of equipment will vary (electronics, robotics and other STEAM fields) and will be targeted toward low-income children.
  - Ms. Markle asked about how low-income kids would be targeted. Ms. Wood said through targeted data, advertisement and outreach, although there would be an open door policy toward all students. Ms. Loyd mentioned that the long-term sustainability of the project would be determined by community needs. Other programs would possibly be cut to sustain the MakerSpace (none specified).
  - Mr. Jones asked how, in evaluation benchmarks, a 60% increase in knowledge was determined. Ms. Wood & Ms. Loyd said that they anticipated that participants would have some basic knowledge, so a 60% increase was reasonable.
  - Ms. Mouton asked about letters of support. Ms. Wood said they were from Georgia White of WNC and Michelle Lewis of the Carson City School District.
  - Ms. Bossart asked why it was geared towards hobbyists. Ms. Loyd said the intent of this project is not to be an industrial work space. Rather, it's meant to help individuals learn, problem solve, and spark interest in future employment in various STEAM areas.
  - Ms. Schmidt asked for the source of the cash match. Ms. Loyd said it was from the

Friends of the Library.

- **Great Basin College, *Spread the Knowledge: Access to Special Collections at GBC***. Jeannie Bailey and Christina Clark, via videoconference.
  - Ms. Moulton asked about evidence of need and missing collection items. Ms. Clark spoke on the disappearance of special collections items that were checked out and never returned, stolen, etc. During the last 6 years, an increase was noticed, thus the need to install anti-theft gates and TattleTape.
  - Mr. Jones asked about current gate repair and maintenance. Ms. Clark replied that the gates were too old, were no longer repairable.
  - Ms. Schmidt wanted to know why GBC has not addressed a core item such as loss prevention in the operating budget. Ms. Bailey said that GBC library budget has been so severely reduced that including loss prevention in the budget hasn't been possible.
  - Ms. Markle asked if there were enough staff to actually act if the TattleTape alarm sounded. Ms. Clark said the gates and staff desks were well positioned to visually see the gates.
  - Ms. Lucido asked about the nature of the three staff in-kind match positions in the budget—what are their roles in the project implementation? Ms. Clark said they'd be installing the tape, collecting data, and marketing the special collections once they were secured. The council was assured that there would be enough staff on hand to man the gates, install TattleTape, and ensure collection marketing.
  - Ms. Markle asked about the cost of maintenance contracts. Ms. Clark and Ms. Bailey assured the council that GBC would be able to meet the cost burden. Furthermore, the security gates would be essential to ensuring that California Trail would be willing to host some of their special collection at Great Basin College.
- **Henderson District Libraries, *A New Strategic Plan for Henderson Libraries***. Gail Hornaday, via teleconference.
  - Ms. Moulton asked if proceeds from the Malcolm library building sale would go toward funding a new library to which Ms. Hornaday answered in the affirmative, that the Board would like proceeds to be used to procure a new library building.
  - Ms. Bossart worried that the timeline may not be realistic for such an ambitious project but commended the project on its inclusion of the disabled. Ms. Hornaday agreed that the timeline was intense, but replied that they believed the timeline was feasible, per conversations with an outside consultant.
  - Ms. Schmidt asked if Henderson had made use of consultants before for the strategic planning process. Ms. Hornaday said that they had for the last major plan 10 years ago. She also stated that this was not the first time the Henderson library had used consultants, was confident in their usefulness, and (in response to a further question) that consultant usage was fairly common to access expertise that libraries do not have in-house.
  - Ms. Price asked how the project budget was derived and what criteria would be used to evaluate the consultants' proposals. Ms. Hornaday replied that that was the figure proposed by a consultant with whom they've had experience, covering travel, equipment, a public opinion survey, and sundry other costs.
  - Ms. Peterson asked how the numbers served figure was derived. Ms. Hornaday said that the effects of the project would hopefully reach 100,000 people or roughly 10% more than the current active user population of Henderson library.
- **Mineral County Library, *Youth Digital Learning***. Courtney Oberhansli and Christina Boyles.
  - Mr. Heise asked why they were not partnering with local schools and kindergartens for

this project. Ms. Boyles and Ms. Oberhansli responded that they will be working with the schools, but were striving for a less formal partnership so as not to overtax already limited school staff.

- Ms. Markle wondered when the children would be free to avail themselves of the program. Ms. Boyles and Ms. Oberhansli stated that Fridays were non-school days in Mineral County and that the project would be available on Saturdays and after school.
- Ms. Moulton commented that churches could be involved to which Ms. Oberhansli and Ms. Boyles agreed.
- Robert Jones wondered what the staff would do to facilitate the program and engage students. Ms. Oberhansli and Ms. Boyles assured that staff would be knowledgeable in the programs and games, support students, and helping to ensure a steady retention rate (returning students). Further to this, how did the library intend to keep students engaged beyond the project's duration? They responded that no plan existed to specifically retain students as of yet but there was the hope that a core group of students would continue and their progress could be observed.
- Ms. Bossart stated that she thought the measurable outcomes were vague to which Ms. Oberhansli and Ms. Boyles replied that it was difficult to quantify because many were unwilling to commit to the program upfront, but are aware of the need to track outcomes as the program progresses and respond accordingly. They also stated that they hoped to reach a 'new audience' for the library by issuing library cards through schools and teachers.
- **North Las Vegas Library District, *Developing the Future*.** Forrest Lewis, via teleconference.
  - Ms. Moulton asked what prompted Mr. Lewis to select Stacey Wedding of Professionals in Philanthropy (PiP). Mr. Lewis replied the library felt that it needed an experienced nonprofit consultant who had previously worked with libraries; upon conferring with different non-profits and community organization, and interviewing various consultants, PiP was selected.
  - Ms. Price wondered if the price was fair or if bids had been taken to which Lewis replied that no proposals were solicited since none of the other consultants interviewed had demonstrated that they could provide the needed services. The strategic plan two years before had cost a similar sum to that being asked by Wedding. Mr. Lewis also stated that some monies would go toward training staff and interfacing with trustees and Friends of the Library.
  - Ms. Schmidt asked if the focus was solely on the Friends of the Library and the Library Board. Mr. Lewis said yes, that the 3 major focus points for training would be staff, the Friends, and the Trustees.
  - Ms. Markle asked if Mr. Lewis had a background in development to which he answered in the negative, he had been a children's librarian. The main reason outside consultants were being considered is that library staff are not traditionally trained in these areas.
  - Ms. Moulton commended the letters of support from the staff, board and trustees. Mr. Lewis stated that the community was very supportive of the initiative.
  - Ms. Schmidt noted that the consultant should be working closely with the State Library to ensure compliance with NRS statutes. Mr. Lewis said that was a great point, that Board of Trustee bylaws would be vetted if changed, but that the focus was on the Friends of the Library bylaws.
  - Ms. Etchegoyhen asked for clarification- is a consultant being hired or on-staff coordinator? Mr. Lewis replied that the original thought was to have a development coordinator, but a consultant position would be better suited to their needs

- **UNLV, *Raising the Curtain: Large-Scale Digitization Models for Nevada Cultural Heritage*.** Corey Lampert and Emily Lapworth, via teleconference.
  - Ms. Markle began by stating her enthusiasm for the project as it involved the statewide community, to which Bossart assented. Ms. Lampert and Ms. Lapworth stated that they knew they had an ambitious project but were confident in its viability, as it was based on actual benchmarks from current pilot digitization projects.
  - Ms. Moulton appreciated the documentation supplied regarding scan times.
  - Mr. Jones suggested that the project immediately follow-up on its survey after the conclusion of the symposium instead of waiting a year as stated in the proposal. Ms. Lapworth suggested doing an immediate and then a one year follow up.
  - Ms. Etchegoyhen asked about the budget for the proposed symposium. Ms. Lampert replied that UNLV would host and organize the symposium, reducing associated costs so that the bulk of grant funding could go towards helping people attend. Ms. Lampert and Ms. Lapworth mentioned that they both are active in their community, and thus have support for these events. As they are in the early stages of research, they have participated in discussion, but not done formal presentations about large scale digitization, nor have others. This topic is mostly still in the discussion stage; UNR and UNLV are both active, but there aren't resources for smaller libraries. Mr. Heise suggested a collaboration with Great Basin College regarding digitization. Ms. Lampert said that this project and its associated symposium will be an opportunity to suggest solutions, create collaborations, and also lead to reexamining the Statewide Digital Plan. Mr. Kintop agreed this would be beneficial.
- **UNR, *Yucca Mountain Research Collection Description and Discovery Project*.** Dana Miller.
  - Ms. Moulton commended the project, especially in light of Yucca Mountain's prominence. She wondered why UNR had chosen not to partner with other institutions in this project. Ms. Miller admitted this was a weakness of the project, but mentioned that as a large, hidden collection, with no basic access, inventory, or MARC records, it was best for UNR create basic access before involving others as there are 84 feet of materials to organize.
  - Ms. Lucido questioned why the grant would cover the organization and cataloging of 80% of the collection and not 100%. Ms. Miller said that original cataloging can be a very long process; Ms. Lewis and her colleagues were reticent to promise something they may be unable to ultimately deliver. This figure (80%) was arrived at by gauging how much work two part-time student workers would be able to collect and catalog in a single semester. However, cataloging would continue beyond the grant's timeframe until completion. She further stated that UNR will be able to identify potential items for digitization while organizing and cataloging the documents.
  - Mr. Kintop mentioned the collections contained at the Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects as a potential future collaboration.
- **Washoe County Library, *Automation for Early Literacy and Makerspaces*.** Jeff Scott, via teleconference.
  - Ms. Price asked where the eight machine handlers were to be placed as the narrative mentioned 20 sites, including daycares and medical clinics. Mr. Scott stated that for the greatest efficiency, the handlers would go in the eight main Washoe County Library branches, the other 4 branches are partnership sites and much smaller. The daycares and clinics are not branch locations, they are proposed literacy outreach centers, and a direct benefit of the potential cost savings in staff hours that would be realized by the materials handlers.

- Mr. Jones asked why there were no letters of support from proposed outreach facilities to which Mr. Scott said that the library had identified partners and was currently cultivating those relationships with Head Start, family care centers, and Renown and had very positive response, but no formal agreement has been established to date.
- Ms. Markle asked what RFID tags did in relationship to the material handlers. Scott replied that they facilitate easier, digital check-in of books via a sort-and-scan functionality. This tagging was already in process.
- Ms. Moulton and Mr. Jones were pleased with the school collaboration and the student library card sign-up and usage component in the evaluation, but would like to see the project monitor the progress of the literacy program in schools.
- Ms. Bossart asked why there was such a high in-kind staff contribution included in the budget when the project stated that staff time was at a premium. Mr. Scott replied that this would be a one-time staff cost to tag and order materials, after which, staff time would be freed to devote to outreach projects.
- Ms. Schmidt thought the proposed project was admirable, especially the early literacy component. Washoe County Library taking a leadership role in this is extremely important. With that said, the project would be strengthened by obtaining partnership commitments and suggested a promotional activity to show Washoe's commitment to its community.
- **Las Vegas Clark County Library District, *STEAM FORWARD: Building the Next Generation Workforce in Libraries*.** Danielle Milam was unable to participate due to unforeseen circumstances. Their session is rescheduled to January 26 as a written Q&A.

#### **11. 2017 LSTA Applicant Discussion**

Due to time constraints, this item will be discussed on Thursday, January 25, 2017.

#### **12. Public Comment.**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

No public comment

#### **13. Adjourn.**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

Motion to adjourn for the day made by Ms. Price, seconded by Ms. Markle. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.

#### **Thursday, January 25, 2017**

#### **14. Call to order, Announcements, Roll Call**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

The meeting was called to at 9:05 am.

Members present: Dee Dee Bossart, Ananda Campbell-Richards, Cris Etchegoyhen, Jeanne Frazier Price, Robert Jones, Betts Markle, Nancy Schmidt, Sheila Moulton, Karsten Heise, Kim Petersen

Excused: Jeanette Hammons, Margot Chappel, Kathleen Galland-Collins, Renee Olsen, Connie Lucido, Ian Salzman

Secretary of Council: Jeffrey Kintop

Nevada State Library, Archives and Public Records Staff: Tammy Westergard, Sulin Jones

#### **15. Public Comment**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

No public comment

#### **11. LSTA 2017 Competitive Grant Application Review**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

**(discussion/for possible action)**

Ms. Bossart mentioned that review would follow the order of the Q&A and asked for clarification regarding the bonus 5 points available on the evaluation rubric. Ms. Westergard said that it would be cash in hand contributed towards new resources.

- Carson City Library. Mr. Heise expressed a wish to integrate the library's MakerSpace project with other similar projects, like Adam's Hub or WNC, so that the total is greater than the sum of the parts. Ms. Schmidt commented that the \$4500 cash match from Friends of the Library would qualify for 5-points-extra on the ranking. Ms. Campbell-Richards commented their self-staffing and sustainability of the program was strong, as was their ability to leverage funds from previous grants.
- Great Basin College Library. Ms. Schmidt commented that a letter of assurance was needed to ensure that antitheft devices would be maintained by GBC after they're installed. Mr. Heise wished to facilitate a conversation between UNLV and GBC to digitize the disappearing collection at GBC. Ms. Markle commented on the fallibility of security gates and TattleTape: Could RFID be an option instead of TattleTape? Ms. Schmidt suggested GBC consider pursuing alternatives, although the grant request was legitimate.
- Henderson Library. Ms. Petersen thought the proposal seemed disordered, as 5 year plans are mandatory. Ms. Westergard commented on issues with a library leadership change and desire to bring the whole of Henderson Libraries into alignment. Ms. Markle commented that an outside consultant could provide a fresh perspective. Ms. Price said she thought the grant was premature and Ms. Moulton agreed, as they didn't have a director in place. Ms. Schmidt asked if Henderson Friends would be involved in the process and wondered who was providing the \$4,000 cash match. Mr. Jones pointed out there were letters of support. Ms. Markle and Ms. Etchegoyhen suggested that bids from potential consultants be provided to Council to help to assuage misgivings. Ms. Richards commented that having a director in place may be the best way to set Henderson on the right path; a consultant without a director may not be as worthwhile. Ms. Schmidt agreed that a director needed to be part of the strategic planning process from the start. Ms. Moulton asked if there was a way to set aside funds until a better plan was formulated. Ms. Westergard answered in the negative and suggested that perhaps the proposal was premature and better left until the next grant cycle, which would begin in September. Council recommended that the project be re-submitted during the 2018 LSTA cycle, once a director is in place.
- Las Vegas-Clark County Library District. Ms. Jones and Ms. Etchegoyhen read Las Vegas's written responses from the previous day. See Appendix A for detailed information. Ms. Westergard commented that this proposal was outstanding and other libraries could benefit from reviewing their application. Ms. Schmidt commented that it was a great example of leveraging LSTA grant funds and building on them within the community.
- Mineral County Library. Mr. Jones liked the idea, but would still like to see a letter of commitment from schools supporting the program. Ms. Moulton commented on the presenting librarians' enthusiasm and expressed faith in their success. Ms. Schmidt showed support for the ability of the library staff in Hawthorne.
- North Las Vegas Library. Ms. Price commented on the strength of the proposal. Ms. Campbell-Richards showed support for the eloquence of the presenters and the positive role a consultant could play in this grant. The supplied letters of support helped greatly.
- UNLV Special Collections. Ms. Markle showed enthusiasm for the project, especially as it was developed to share statewide.
- UNR Special Collections. Ms. Westergard pointed out the importance of this project to Nevada. Ms. Markle liked how UNR and UNLV were committed to leadership in areas such in which



smaller libraries were at a disadvantage. Mr. Kintop pointed out that it's a big collection, with federal and state documents, as well as unpublished review documents and correspondence; there is difficulty in finding information without there being a collated collection.

- Washoe County Library. Ms. Markle felt it was not a strongly written grant. There was assent from several quarters. Members commented on how the grant appeared to be two separate ideas mashed together; that the main project intent -using technology to free staff to focus on core library outreach functions- was obscured by mention of projected outreach facilities. Ms. Schmidt recognized the merit, but agreed that it needs to be rewritten, clarification is needed as to the actual scope and nature of the proposed project. Council recommends that NSLAPR staff work with Washoe County to strengthen and refocus the grant, rewriting to simply address the automation and exclude the outreach. Council will revisit their recommendation after the rewrite.

#### **Grant Scores**

Final 2017 LSTA competitive grant application scores, submitted by Council, tallied and ranked.

**Motion:** Ms. Price moved to accept the LSTA Grant application rankings, seconded by Ms. Moulton. Motion passed.

<b>Library</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Final Score</b>
UNR	Yucca Mountain Research Collection Description and Discovery Project	\$100,000	<b>86</b>
Carson City Library	Makelt@Two: The Maker Movement at the Carson City Library	\$45,000	<b>85</b>
Mineral County Library	Youth Digital Learning	\$23,245	<b>83</b>
UNLV	Raising the Curtain: Large-Scale Digitization Models for Nevada Cultural Heritage	\$97,937	<b>83</b>
Las Vegas-Clark County Library	STEAM FORWARD: Building the Next Generation Workforce in Libraries	\$100,000	<b>82</b>
Great Basin College	Spread the Knowledge: Access to Special Collections at GBC	\$49,597	<b>80</b>
North Las Vegas	Developing the Future	\$90,000	<b>77</b>
Henderson District Libraries	A New Strategic Plan for Henderson Libraries	\$95,000	<b>64</b>
Washoe County Library	Automation for Early Literacy and Makerspaces	\$96,000	<b>58</b>

#### **16. Adult Basic Education**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

- Ms. Bossart spoke about her background in adult education and disability resources. She would like to see adult literacy and basic education brought back into the library fold and addressed at least once per year on the Council agenda. Nancy Olson is the new Adult Education supervisor

and is a potential resource for libraries. Ms. Westergard concurred that it is a vital aspect of libraries to provide those resources, and they do address these needs as part of their core services; yet the work isn't always noticed, connections aren't always seen. Ms. Markle mentioned that Read by 3 is great, but added that we should be paying attention to what happens after.

- Ms. Petersen, representing Department of Corrections, pointed out the need for library services by former inmates who are integrating back into communities. The Nevada Department of Education is part of the Nevada Correctional Educational Consortium. A portion of adult education money goes to teach literacy in the corrections system in order to reduce recidivism; currently, 8 school districts teach adult basic education in the prisons. When these inmates emerge, most will still need basic education services, as well as technology instruction.
- Ms. Westergard mentioned libraries can be a portal to education, and that NSLAPR can help facilitate this and bring to light potential partnerships and programs.

### **17. Statewide Program Updates**

**Tammy Westergard**

- Ms. Westergard touched on several topics briefly, including reading program activities, summer reading, and DIA/Diversity in Action. Nevada Reads is finishing up, and Letters for Literature and Center for the Book are currently in progress. She touched on the need to fund coding programs as coding is an integral part of future literacies. She presented a chart showing how project-based learning and code-as-literacy programs have been utilized in Nordic countries and how they can be applicable to the local libraries. A partnership with Civic Technologies has grown into a statewide opportunity to use Community Connect which allows libraries to discover their current user demographics and help target future plans in that direction. Similarly, Ms. Westergard spoke about the Edge Initiative software tool which helps libraries understand and deploy technology. Essentially, it is used to justify why technology is needed and when.
- Ms. Petersen noted that there's a direct correlation between childhood reading scores and incarceration rates. She also offered a shout out to Hope Williams of Talking Books for doing a great job, especially with the inmates.

### **18. LSTA program Updates**

**Sulin Jones**

- LSTA 2015. The 2015 cycle ended on June 30, 2016. Final evaluations were due in October 2016. This program update contains final project evaluation narratives as reported by the subgrantees. In addition, the 2015 State Program Report (SPR) has been submitted to IMLS for approval. The two strong, innovative projects chosen as exemplaries for the 2015 SPR were LVCCLD's *PreK for All/Mind in the Making* project and Carson City Library's *Nevada's Working Capital* workforce training program, the first of its kind in the nation. Mr. Heise spoke to the nature of Carson City's program and its successes.
- LSTA 2016. We are in the middle of the 2016 cycle. Midyear evaluations have just been submitted, so this update contains excerpts from those midyear narratives.
- LSTA 2017. Nevada has received a partial award. As IMLS is operating under a Continuing Resolution until April 28, 2017, any additional award amounts are subject to congressional approval.

### **19. Statewide Master Plan**

**Tammy Westergard**

- Ms. Westergard reported that the process was started last May with library directors. Staff have compiled progress to date into a LibGuide. As a complementary piece, Ms. Westergard

proposed putting together a monthly newsletter, sent on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday of the month, to keep members abreast of any changes. It was agreed that this was a good idea. The 5-year LSTA plan is currently underway and due March 31. Findings from this evaluation will be used to construct the new Statewide Plan.

**20. Set Council Dates**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

- April 12, 2017 was proposed for next meeting. **Motion.** Ms. Markle moved to accept April 12, 2017 for the next meeting. Mr. Heise seconded. Motion passed.

**21. Public Comment**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

No public comment

**22. Adjourn**

**Dee Dee Bossart**

**Motion.** Ms. Markle moved to end the meeting, Ms. Moulton seconded. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 12 pm.

**Appendix A**

**Las Vegas-Clark County Library District written responses to Council Questions and Comments**

**1. The grant project period is for one year. What are the plans for continued sustainability? Will staff be trained in implementation?**

The most important element of sustainability is strong support from the highest levels of the organization. The LVCCLD's V.2020 Strategic Plan was developed by a 30 member cross-organizational team of staff members, enthusiastically adopted by our Board of Trustees last January, and shared broadly with community stakeholders who endorse the plan's emphasis on STEAM implementation as part of both the Limitless Learning and Business and Career Success strategic directions. The MOU with Workforce Connections was inspired in part by the shared strategic objectives of both organizations as related to STEAM skill building in the region tied to future economic development and workforce readiness.

The next important element of sustainability is staff training. This project is designed to develop an effective way to engage staff as facilitators of STEAM programs throughout the branches quickly and effectively. The engagement of 12 branches in the 18 camps and 133 projects will give Youth Service Librarians, Branch Managers, Adult Programming, and Adult Reference staff the opportunity to observe AND debrief projects with the consultant team and respective staff meetings for program development and strategic plan implementation. A "learning circle" method of staff engagement will surface a group of "early adopters" who will be mobilized to oversee and push out future programming. It is our hope that a strong model of student interns will support continued staff training and facilitation of interactive STEAM programs and "lab" hours where students can continue to tinker with STEAM projects and move their skills and aptitudes towards mastery. We see the ultimate model as one that incorporates STEAM

principals and projects into all children and youth programs and activities. For the tween and teen age groups the model will ultimately be one of engaged learning where the youth are training other youth and the project activity areas are based on youth interests. For the youngest group, children's librarians will also engage parents to learn of the children's interests and develop programs based on those interests, across STEAM discipline areas.

During the year we will also be reviewing branch space configurations to be sure we have the furniture, fixtures, equipment storage continuous engaged learning environment that can sustain this work long-term. If space renovations are needed, specific schematics will be developed in the upcoming Master Facilities Plan.

Another important element of sustainability is building a sustainable pipeline. For this project we chose a locally based consultant group that has strong experience and relationships with the local schools. We will be able to continue to contract with them in the future to refresh our program content and further our staff training and intern development pipeline.

**2. Nice community commitment, great concept.**

We are very fortunate to have strong new and existing community partnerships in place to support a successful, model-building project.

**3. There is \$5,000 allocated to observe national models. If a consultant is being contracted with to implement the project, why is travel necessary?**

The national models for STEAM programs in libraries, museums, community centers, and schools are blooming now. Many states have Governor-led initiatives, including Nevada. There are many conferences where our staff can join in conversations with national colleagues to learn best practices and shift their thinking to the model of engaged learning. Being a facilitator for STEAM programming can be intimidating for some staff who entered the library field in the era of transactions..finding books and media on shelves vs. facilitating active learning and project-based learning. As we identify enthusiastic "early adopter" staff, we will augment their local experience with opportunities to travel to observe other STEAM program implementation models and/or to attend national conferences that feature multi-institutional STEAM programs across civic, neighborhood, and school contexts so that they can be effective trainers and program roll-out implementers.

**4. What criteria were used to choose the consultant? Are costs in line with similar programs? Does the consultant have a track record of success?**

Our consultants, Engineering for Kids, were chosen based on several criteria. As we learned from a 2013 National Leadership Grant project with other national public libraries and museums (funded by the Institute of Museum and Library Services), to develop Teen TechArt Studios for digital media experimentation and production, we knew we need a team with experience in 1)project-based learning, 2)parent, child, and youth engaged learning techniques, 3)drop-in program implementation experience, 4)track record in delivering successful and effective programs, and 5)strong ties to local schools and the national Common Core curricula standards.

We also learned that it is important to have a local team. In the Teen TechArt Studio project, we engaged fabulous consultants from California with deep-level experience related to the above criteria, but they only available to come train several times a year. This was not sufficient to embed the program in an 18-month program, so we focused on finding a local team to work with for this project. The Engineering for Kids program was the only consultant we found with strong credentials and demonstrated experience in all the criteria categories, and the ability to provide a critical mass of projects over the course of a year to get staff familiar with new program content and program facilitation models of project-based and engaged learning models.

**5. This is an ambitious project. Please comment on the ability of LVCCLD to fully implement.**

As mentioned in Question 4, this is not a start-up model for LVCCLD. We have had the good fortune to train staff on the foundations of good STEAM program implementation in the earlier Teen TechArt Studio grant project. In that work, we discovered some of the cultural, institutional, staff competency, space configuration, and program delivery barriers that inform how we propose to roll out this project. With strong support from LVCCLD leadership and executive staff, as well as expertise from community partners and national colleagues, we anticipate that this one-year project will very successfully embed STEAM program into library children, youth and parent programs, bringing those foundational concepts and interactive experiences to local families and youth so that they are inspired to develop skills and knowledge needed for lucrative careers in STEAM-related fields and enterprises.

**6. Please clarify how the \$10,000 in-kind materials figure was determined.**

Again, as we learned in the Teen TechArt project and limited new programs that engage youth with legos, LittleBits, DJ lab equipment, Ozbots, Spheros, 3-D pens, and digital media equipment, it is important to grow in-branch supplies and storage capacity as these programs grow in demand. Our Collections and Bibliographic Services Department has committed to a \$20,000 line item for this project in the FY17-18 operating budget based on projected costs for purchasing "learning collection" projected small supplies needed to replicate Engineering for Kids model curriculum projects, as well as connecting kids to new STEAM-related toys and supplies mentioned above. The line item will be further detailed based on the enthusiasm and interest areas of local youth in camps and programs and the costs of buying supplies related to high interest programs to support the program during the grant and beyond.

**7. What will the \$5,000 in printing and postage be used for?**

The LVCCLD Marketing and Branding department will produce designed posters and informational materials that will be printed for distribution to community centers, day cares, schools, branch libraries, and other venues frequented by parents, children and youth. These materials will be distributed digitally for the most part, through social media, school intranet, and organizational e-newsletters, but part of the \$5,000 not used for printing will be spent on buying ads for further program promotion and program audience development in the community.

**8. School internships – impressive proposal.**

We have a wonderful working relationship with the CCSD's Office of Community-School Partnership and in particular, with Cheryl Wagner who has a passion for STEAM and intimate knowledge of science faculty and intern engagement opportunities within CCSD.

**9. Appreciation letter of support from district...nice!**

**10. Evaluation surveys of participants, 4-14 age group. How will you survey 4-8 year olds?**

The surveys will be designed as three to four questions that parents can fill out on an ipad as they exit the program. Sample questions may include: Did you learn anything new? Did your child take interest in this program? Did you learn something about building your child's brain and learning? Would you recommend this program to another family? We will be conducting the 4-8 age programs as newly-branded "brain-building" programs rather than "storytimes."

**11. Formal MOUs with partners – strong collaboration in place!**

We are very fortunate to have ENTHUSIASTIC support from Workforce Connections, which will be bringing their STEM mobile classroom, contributing small equipment like 3-D printers, and bringing further STEAM instructional expertise to all our metro libraries and potentially two rural libraries in Mesquite and Laughlin. Further, they will connect the library with other regional, state, and national STEAM partners working with children, youth and families on STEAM education initiatives.